

THIRD DRAFT 2/22/68

Dear Senator Fulbright:

The questions relating to the seizure of the <u>Pueblo</u> contained in your letter of February 3 to Secretary Rusk have been intensively studied in the Executive Branch. Because of the predominantly military character of many of the problems raised, the Department of Defense has prepared the answers to Questions 1-7 (except the last part of Question 4), 12, 14, 15, and 18. Other Departments and Agencies concerned have been consulted and have contributed, and this Department, in addition to providing the balance of the answers, has collated and assembled the material. For the reasons discussed below, we submit at this time only partial answers to Questions 1, 4, 5, 12, and 14 and no answers to Questions 19, 19, and 20.

In the case of Questions 1 and 4 on the decision to dispatch the <u>Pueblo</u>, our review of the procedures by which the mission of the <u>Pueblo</u> was approved has shown that in this Department, in the Department of Defense, and in other Agencies concerned with these matters, the established procedures were followed and the mission was known to and approved by the designated representatives of the Department and Agency heads. The Secretary of State and other Department or Agency heads carry the responsibility for these actions by their designated representatives and they do not consider it proper to place in the record with the Legislative Branch the names of the individuals concerned.

2

The Secretary of State has been personally informed over a period of years about appropriate aspects of intelligence activities of this character. The particular intelligence plan involving the <u>Pueblo</u> was approved in late December by all the agencies involved, including the Department of State. (Further discussion of Question 4 is attached at Tab 4.)

In the case of Questions 5, 12, and 14, full compliance with the Committee's request would involve the transmittal of a large volume of military documents. These documents are both highly technical and highly sensitive. If the material provided herewith on these military matters does not meet the Committee's needs, I will discuss with you and with the Department of Defense what further arrangements might be made.

In the case of Question 10, we feel that it would not be in the national interest to release or reduce the security classification of any more of the material intercepted from North Korean sources before, during, and after the seizure of the <u>Pueblo</u>. An intensive examination of this material has only reinforced earlier evidence of the basic fact that the <u>Pueblo</u> was seized in international waters. It has not thrown any light on other points of substance. In particular, it has not provided any indication as to whether the <u>Pueblo</u> might, at some time before its seizure, have approached closer than twelve miles to some point of North Korean territory. (We continue to believe that at no time did the <u>Pueblo</u> penetrate closer than thirteen miles to North Korea,

Approved for Release 2004/02/09 CIA-RDP70B00338R000200220039-0



Questions 19 and 20 are, as you will recognize both hypothetical and of a very far-reaching character. In the interest of providing the Committee with a comprehensive and responsive discussion of the matters raised, these two questions will be made the subject of a separate communication to you.

Sincerely yours,

William B. Macomber, Jr. Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations